



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/787,618

09/25/2001

Martin Keller

3245-799 PUS

5959

7590

07/14/2004

Thomas C Pontani  
Cohen Pontani Lieberman & Pavane  
551 Fifth Avenue Suite 1210  
New York, NY 10176

EXAMINER

FERGUSON, KEITH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2683

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/787,618

Applicant(s)

KELLER ET AL.

Examiner

Keith T. Ferguson

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17, 19-22, 25-27 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 23, 24 and 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2683

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text.

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 18, line 3, recites the phrase "the disturbance" it should recite "a disturbance". Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Slekeys et al..

The claimed invention reads on Slekeys et al. as follows:

Art Unit: 2683

Regarding claims 21 and 22, Slekeys et al. discloses a method (fig. 3) for planning a mobile radio network (col. 2 lines 7-65), comprising selecting at least one physical channel having a different wanted-to-unwanted signal ratio (i.e. a signal radio frequency power levels from substantial zero power to a non zero power level indicative to the presence of voice transmission) for a data channel than for a voice channel (col. 2 lines 24-54).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 15,16,17,25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slekeys et al. in view of Joel, Jr..

Regarding claim 15, Slekeys et al. discloses a method (fig. 3) for allocating a channel requested for a telecommunication link via a telecommunication network (col. 2 lines 15-24): the method comprising the steps of: selecting at least one physical channel having a different wanted-to-unwanted signal ratio (i.e. a signal radio frequency power levels from substantial zero power to a non zero power level indicative to the presence of voice transmission) when a data channel is requested than when a voice channel is requested (col. 2 lines 33-54); and allocating a physical channel for an air interface in a mobile radio network

Art Unit: 2683

(col. 2 lines 40-65). Slekeys et al. differs from claim 1 of the present invention in that it does not disclose allocating a channel between a caller and a called party. Joel, Jr. teaches cell center which connect a mobile station to an assign landline to a called station (col. 3 line 67 through col. 4 line 17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slekeys et al. with allocating a channel between a caller and a called party in order for the mobile station to be presented with a data channel to send a text message to a distant call party, as taught by Joel, Jr..

Regarding claims 16 and 26, Slekeys et al. discloses (preferentially) selecting when a data channel is requested, at least one physical channel having a better wanted-to-unwanted signal ratio than when a voice channel is requested (col. 2 lines 33-54).

Regarding claims 17 and 27, Slekeys et al. discloses allocating a number of physical channels to one data channel (col.2 lines 48-54).

Regarding claim 25, Slekeys et al. discloses a mobile radio telecommunication network (fig. 1), comprising a plurality of adjoining mobile radio cells (fig. 1 number 18) having channel allocation devices (fig. 1 numbers 16 and 36) for allocating requested channels to at least one of a caller (col.2 lines 15-54), the channel allocation devices being operative so that at least one physical channel having a different wanted-to-unwanted signal ratio (i.e. a signal radio frequency power levels from substantial zero power to a non zero power level indicative to the presence of voice transmission) is selected when a data channel is requested than when a voice channel is requested (col. 2 lines 15-54), the allocation of a physical channel being effected for an air interface in a mobile radio network (col. 2 lines 15-54). Slekeys et al. differs from claim 25 of present invention in that it does not disclose allocating a channel between a caller and a called party. Joel, Jr. teaches cell center which connect a mobile station to an assign landline to a called station (col. 3 line 67 through col. 4 line 17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slekeys et al. with allocating a channel between a caller and a called party in order for the mobile station to be presented with a data

Art Unit: 2683

channel to send a text message to a distant call party, as taught by Joel, Jr..

7. Claims 19 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slekeys et al. in view of Joel, Jr. as applied to claims 15 and 25 above and in further view of Davidson et al..

Regarding claims 19 and 29, the combination of Slekeys et al. and Joel, Jr. differs from claim 20 of the present invention in that they do not disclose wherein the data channel is a duplex channel connected between the caller and the called party. Davidson et al. teaches a data channel is a duplex channel connected between the caller and the called party (col. 3 lines 35-52 and col. 5 lines 20-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Slekeys et al. and Joel, Jr. with wherein the data channel is a duplex channel connected between the caller and the called party in order to have a two data text message transmission between the remote units, as taught by Davidson et al..

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slekeys et al. in view of Joel, Jr. as applied to claim 15 above and in further view of Malmstrom.

Regarding claim 20, the combination of Slekeys et al. and Joel, Jr. differs from claim 20 of the present invention in that they do not disclose a packet-switching data transmission between the caller and the called party. Malmstrom teaches packet-switching data transmission when a caller dials a subscriber telephone number (col. 5 lines 4-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Slekeys et al. and Joel, Jr. with a packet-switching data transmission between the caller and the called party in order to send a text message from the remote unit to a distant remote unit, as taught by Malmstrom.

Art Unit: 2683

*Allowable Subject Matter*

9. Claims 18,23,24 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding claim 18, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination wherein the better wanted-to-unwanted signal ratio of a data channel compared with a voice channel is achieved by allocating, in a mobile radio cell, at least one physical channel in each case to a data channel the disturbance of which by physical channels of at least one of identical and adjacent frequencies in adjacent radio cells is less than in the case of other physical channels.

Regarding claim 23, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination achieving the better wanted-to-unwanted signal ratio of a data channel compared with a voice channel by allocating in a mobile radio cell in each case at least one physical channel to a data channel having disturbance by physical channels of the same and/or adjacent frequencies in adjacent radio cells that is less than in other physical channels.

Regarding claim 24, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination achieving the different wanted-to-unwanted signal ratio of a data channel compared with a voice channel by allocating in a mobile radio cell in each case at least one physical channel to a data channel having disturbance by physical channels of the same and/or adjacent frequencies in adjacent radio cells that is less than in other physical channels.

Regarding claim 28, the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination wherein the allocation devices are operative to select the better wanted-to-unwanted signal ratio of a data channel compared with a voice channel by allocating in a mobile radio cell in each case at least one

Art Unit: 2683

physical channel to a data channel, the disturbance of which by physical channels of at least one of identical and adjacent frequencies in adjacent radio cells is less than in other physical channels.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Keith T. Ferguson whose telephone number is (703) 305-4888. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (703) 308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Application/Control Number: 09/787,618

Page 8

Art Unit: 2683

Keith Ferguson

Art Unit 2683

July 9, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. H. F.', followed by a long horizontal line.